

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430) Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.orupo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/579,954	05/22/2006	Yuan-Yong Yan	P03096US2A (BJ001d)	9285		
Bridgestone A	7590 03/09/2009 mericas Holding Inc	EXAM	EXAMINER			
Chief Intellectual Property Counsel			BOYLE, ROBERT C			
1200 Firestone Akron, OH 44			ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1796			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/09/2009	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/579.954 YAN ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

		ROBERT C. BOYLE	1796	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ac	ldress
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY DHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DY MAISSING MINISTER IN A CONTROL OF THE MAILING DY MAINS OF THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (A) In no event, however, may a reply be tilt  (I) I apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  Cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this o ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01/28</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-3.9.10 and 21-35</u> is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3.9-10. 21-35</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filled onis/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the a Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Theorem 1.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 C	
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some colone of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  Education from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage
Attachmen	nt(s)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary     Paper No(s)/Mail D		

 Notice of Dratisperson 5 - decline (FTO/Sbr08)
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/Sbr08) 5) Notice of Informal Patert Application Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_. 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1796

#### DETAILED ACTION

### Response to Amendment

 The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- Any rejections stated in the previous Office Action and not repeated below are withdrawn.
- The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- Any rejections stated in the previous Office Action and not repeated below are withdrawn.
- 5. The new grounds of rejection set forth below are necessitated by applicant's amendment filed on January 28, 2009. In particular, claims 21-35 have been added. Although claims 21-35 correspond to claims 4-8 and 11-20, these latter claims were canceled prior to a first office action on the merits. Thus the presentation of claims 21-35, regardless of their relationship to claims 4-8 and 11-20, represent newly introduced limitations. Thus, the following action is properly made FINAL.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

 Claims 1-3, 9-10, 21-27 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Labauze, U.S. Patent 5,811,479.

Art Unit: 1796

 The rejections regarding claims 1-3 and 9-10 are adequately set forth in paragraphs 2-5 in the office action mailed on October 28, 2008 and is incorporated here by reference.

- As to claims 21-23, 30-31, Labauze teaches using hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane (column 5, line 13).
- As to claim 24, Labauze teaches anionic polymerization in a solvent (column 4, lines 3-22).
- As to claims 25, 32-35, Labauze teaches statistical polymerization of styrene and butadiene with 20-40 wt% styrene content and a 1,2 content from 4-80% (column 3, lines 29-67).
- 11. As to claims 26-27, Labauze teaches the primary amino groups and siloxane functionalities on the on the siloxane that is added to the polymer (column 2, lines 30-36; column 3, lines 1-16; column 4, lines 29-67; column 8, lines 46-56; column 10, lines 29-35).
- In view of the above discussion, it is concluded that the cited present claims stand properly anticipated over the applied reference.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Labauze in view of Brockman U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0173607. The discussion with respect to Labauze as set forth in paragraphs 6-11 above is incorporated here by reference.

- 14. Labauze does not teach that the functional group has halogen atoms or a sultone. Brockman teaches reacting a living polymer with a functionalizing compound which includes epichlorohydrin, haloalkyltrialkoxysilanes, and propane sultone (abstract; paragraphs 0078-94). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art that compound capable of functionalizing a living polymer as taught in Brockman could be used with the living polymer taught in Labauze because both teach functionalizing living polymers for use in tire compositions (Labauze: abstract; Brockman: paragraph 00179).
- 15. In view of the above discussion, it is concluded that the cited present claims stand properly obvious over the applied references.

### Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments filed on January 28, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 17. Applicant argues that examiner misconstrued the teachings of US'479. Applicant argues that US'479 does not teach *reaction* between the amine compounds added to the siloxane functionalized polymer as required by claims 1 and 9. Applicant points to language in US'479 which includes:

Art Unit: 1796

...an elastomer comprising at least one functionalized diene polymer bearing at the chain end a silanol function or a polysiloxane block having a silanol end, or modified along the chain by silanol functions at least one organosilane compound comprising an amine or imine function in accordance with general formula I. (column 7. lines 17-22)

and

- ...or modified along the chain by silanol functions with at least one organosilane compound comprising one or more amine or imine functions. (column 2, lines 17-20)
- 18. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.
- 19. The language cited by Applicant states that the elastomer is modified with a silanol fuction that has an organosilane with an amine function. This shows the siloxane functionalized polymer was reacted with the amine. It is examiner's position that the above cited sections of US'479 do not teach mixtures, but final products with the amine incorporated into the polymer. Therefore, US'479 teaches the *reaction* of the amine with the siloxane functionalized polymer.
- 20. Further, the Applicant points to the examples taught in US'479. Examples 1-3 teach the combination of a functionlized polymer which is mixed with various amine compounds. Reaction between the funtionalized polymer and the amine compounds clearly occurs as evidenced by the improved reinforcement and hysteresis properties compared with non-functionalized polymers and the observation that addition of the amine has practically no effect on the non-functionalized polymers (column 10, line 45-column 11, line 10). Alternatively, the examples 1-3 show a preferred embodiment; however all disclosures. "including unpreferred embodiments" must be considered. *In re*

Art Unit: 1796

Lamberti 192 USPQ 278, 280 (CCPA 1976) citing In re Mills 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972).

21. Because of the above, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,954

Art Unit: 1796

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT C. BOYLE whose telephone number is (571)270-7347. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00AM-5:00PM Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571)272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. C. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796